

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vrignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/056,710	11/13/2001	Nabil Rizkalla	SD-200B	SD-200B 3266	
75	590 09/12/2003				
William C. Long, Esq. 90 Maple Avenue Morristown, NJ 07960			EXAMINER		
			NGUYEN, NGOC YEN M		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1754		
			DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		·	
•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/056,710	RIZKALLA ET AL.	
•	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen	1754	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address	
THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (' condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	 a timely filed amendment whi 	cation. A proper reply to a ich places the application in	
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date o	f the final rejection.	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	e fee. The appropriate extension fee under the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in	
 A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF 	•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:		
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note to	pelow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or simplifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claims.	
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection	etion(s):		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed amendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request fo application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does NOT place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaused by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected:	·		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. \square The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) approved or b) disapp	proved by the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
		Ngoc-Yen M. Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1754	

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)



Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the prior art promoter combinations require a pnictogen component (US patent 5,905,053), a lanthanide component (US patent 5,958, 844) or a germanium or tin component (US patent 5,854,167) and such components are taught as having a metarial effect on the basic characteristics of the promoter combinations and accordingly are excluded from the compositions set forth in Applicants' claims through use of the "consisting essentially" phrase. Such argument is not persuasive, because "consisting essentially" phrase does not close the claim to all other materials, only those contrary and inimicable to the claimed invention, In re Janakirama Rao, 137 USPQ 893. In this case, the catalyst as disclosed in the applied references, i.e., US patents '053, '844 and '167, even with the extra component, is still suitable for being used in a process for oxidation of ethylene to ethylene dioxide as required in Applicants' claims. In other words, the presence of the extra components in the catalyst of the applied references does not have any negative effect on the performance of such catalyst in the process of producing ethylene dioxide from ethylene.